

have all of Monday without any limitation, is that what I hear? How long do you anticipate that we would then be going on Monday?

Mr. ARMEY. Monday evening.

Mr. MINETA. No set time?

Mr. ARMEY. No, there would be no set time. Of course, participation is determined by the number of Members here. We would obviously like to get as much of that debate out of the way while still retaining some opportunity for the principals to have some statements before the end of debate.

Mr. MINETA. I would also like to ask, the Pennsylvania primary or I guess Philadelphia city elections are on Tuesday, and there have been some comments from our colleagues in the Philadelphia area about that. So if they are not able to be back for Monday night's general debate, would they still be able to do general debate or at least make some statements on Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. We would try to accommodate that. Of course as you know the reason we have determined not to have votes Monday night is out of consideration for those folks. Certainly we will talk to them. And of course the sponsor of the amendment would want to have some comments prior to the vote on Tuesday and perhaps one or two others, so we will try to be as accommodating as possible.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would ask the distinguished majority leader, I am troubled to hear of even the possibility that this budget might get as little as 4 hours of time. It has been described as a revolutionary budget, and I know as one of I guess what would be the chief revolutionaries you would have some concern about explaining it fully, and that is barely 1 hour for \$100 billion of Medicare cuts, and I would hope you would work with the Committee on Rules so that we could have a full and complete debate extending over at least a couple of days to explore what this budget means for ordinary American families.

Mr. ARMEY. Let me just say I thank the gentleman from Texas for that observation, and as I said to the gentleman from Missouri, we will work with the Committee on Rules to get as full a debate as we can.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

#### FORMAT FOR MORNING HOUR DEBATES AND SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 4, 1995, relating to morning hour debates be continued through the adjournment of the 2d session of the 104th Congress sine die, except that on Tuesdays the House shall convene for such debates 1 hour earlier

than the time otherwise established by order of the House rather than 90 minutes earlier; and the time for such debates shall be limited to 25 minutes allocated to each party rather than 30 minutes to each; but in no event shall such debates continue beyond the time that falls 10 minutes before the appointed hour for the resumption of legislative business, and with the understanding that the format for recognition for special order speeches first instituted on February 23, 1994, be continued for the same period.

Mr. DOGGETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, these morning hour debates are very important to both sides and I understand there has been consultation on this. We applaud the gentleman's effort.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 15, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### HOURLY MEETING ON THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, May 17, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, May 18, 1995, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1995, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a re-

cess, subject to the call of the Chair, on Thursday, May 18, 1995, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute speeches.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET DOES NOT CUT MEDICARE

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, for the last few days, liberal Democrats have taken to the floor to denounce so-called Medicare cuts.

What cuts?

Where are they?

This chart clearly shows that under the House Republican budget, Medicare funding will increase.

This year, we will spend over \$150 billion on Medicare.

This will not decrease.

Let me be absolutely clear about this—Medicare funding will not decrease.

Under the House Republican plan, Medicare spending will have increased to about \$230 billion by the year 2002.

Let me say that again—Medicare spending will be \$230 billion in the year 2002. Now, if Medicare spending is \$150 billion this year and \$230 billion seven years from now, that is an increase in Medicare spending. Where's the cut?

Only in Washington could an increase be a cut.

Well, the American people are tired of the old Washington accounting methods. Those methods are the very reason we have a \$5 trillion debt.

Republicans are committed to scrapping the old Washington accounting methods and replacing them with the truth, something not often seen around here.

#### MEDICARE INCREASES

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as we go home for Mother's Day, I think all of us know that mothers have that extrasensory perception about when people are fudging. Well, let me tell you, there is going to be a lot of fudging going on here about this budget. You are going to hear it's traditional family values.

But let me ask a question? Do you know any family in America that when they pull up to the table to put their